

**-- REMARKS --**

The present amendment replies to a Non-Final Office Action dated November 20, 2002. Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims have been amended to more particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, and claims 18-20 have been added.

In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Polk objected to and rejected pending claims 1-17 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each objection and rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112:

- A. Claims 9, 16 and 17 were objected for lacking antecedent basis for various limitations.

The Applicant has amended claims 9, 16 and 17 herein to obviate this objection to claims 9, 16 and 17. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection of claims 9, 16 and 17 is respectfully requested.

- B. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,422,519 to *Russell*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Polk's remarks concerning the patentability of independent claim 1 over *Russell*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Russell*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1, *Russell* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 1 in as complete detail as in contained in independent claim 1. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1, because *Russell* fails to disclose and teaches away from "wherein said first electric conductor is operable to transfer a magnetic energy and an electric energy across an interface to said second electric conductor in response to a reception of an alternating electric signal" as originally recited in independent claim 1.

Specifically, *Russell* discloses a core 2 and core 3 that transfers electric power in the form of magnetic energy across an interface between core 2 and core 3 in response to an alternating electric signal. *Russell* teaches an electrical isolation between core 2 and core 3 by a skin 4 that prevents a transfer of electric energy across the interface between core 2 and core 3. See, *Russell* at column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 8.

The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Russell*.

- C. Claims 5-9, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,742,408 to *Jaeger*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Polk's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 5-9, 14 and 15 over *Jaeger*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Jaeger*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of independent claims 5-9, *Jaeger* must show each and every limitation of independent claim 5 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 5. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claim 5, because *Jaeger* fails to disclose, teach or "wherein said first electric conductor is operable to transfer a first magnetic energy and a first electric energy across an interface to said second electric conductor in response to a reception of the first electric signal" as originally recited in independent claim 5.

Specifically, *Jaeger* discloses a toroid 12 and a toroid 22 interconnected by single-turn loop 30 for inductively coupling a source 10 and a load 20. See, *Jaeger* at column 1, line 62 to column 2, line 18. *Jaeger* fails to disclose, teach or suggest (1) any transfer of magnetic energy between toroid 12 and toroid 22, and (2) a capacitive coupling of source 10 and load 20. In fact, the terms "magnet", "magnetic", "capacitor" and "capacitively" are not even mentioned or discussed in *Jaeger*.

The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Jaeger*.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 14 and 15 herein. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Jaeger*.

Claims 6-9 depend from independent claim 5. Therefore, dependent claims 6-9 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 5. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 6-9 are allowable over *Jaeger* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Jaeger* is respectfully requested.

- D. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,521,573 to *Inoh* et al

The Applicant has cancelled independent claim 13 herein. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Inoh* is respectfully requested.

- E. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,422,519 to Russell in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,521,573 to *Inoh* et al.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 2 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 2 is allowable over *Russell* in view of *Inoh* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 2 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over *Russell* in view of *Inoh* is therefore respectfully requested.

- F. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,422,519 to *Russell* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,814,900 to *Esser et al.*

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 3 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 3 is allowable over *Russell* in view of *Esser* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 3 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over *Russell* in view of *Esser* is therefore respectfully requested.

- G. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,422,519 to *Russell* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,087,694 to *Ohno et al.*

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 4 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 4 is allowable over *Russell* in view of *Ohno* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 4 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over *Russell* in view of *Ohno* is therefore respectfully requested.

- H. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,742,408 to *Jaeger* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,521,573 to *Inoh* et al.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 5. Therefore, dependent claim 10 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 5. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 10 is allowable over *Jaeger* in view of *Inoh* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 10 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over *Jaeger* in view of *Inoh* is therefore respectfully requested.

- I. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,742,408 to *Jaeger* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,814,900 to *Esser* et al.

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 5. Therefore, dependent claim 11 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 5. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 11 is allowable over *Jaeger* in view of *Esser* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 11 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over *Jaeger* in view of *Esser* is therefore respectfully requested.

- J. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,742,408 to *Jaeger* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,087,694 to *Ohno* et al.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 5. Therefore, dependent claim 12 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 5. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 12 is allowable over *Jaeger* in view of *Ohno* for at least the same reason as set forth with respect to independent claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 12 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over *Jaeger* in view of *Ohno* is therefore respectfully requested.

- K. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,742,408 to *Jaeger* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,893,332 to *Brown* et al.

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Polk's remarks concerning the patentability of dependent claim 16 over *Jaeger* in view of *Brown*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Jaeger* and *Brown*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of dependent claim 16, all the claim limitations recited in claims 14-16 must be taught or suggested by the combination of *Jaeger* and *Brown*. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §103(a) rejection of dependent claim 16, because *Jaeger* and *Brown* in combination fails to disclose, teach or “means for capacitively coupling said power source and said third load when first power source and said first load are inductively coupled and when said second power source and said second load are inductively coupled” as recited in dependent claim 16.

Specifically, Examiner Polk has correctly recognized *Jaeger*'s failure to disclose, teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation. While *Brown* teaches a particular use of a capacitive coupling, *Brown* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the capacitive coupling of a power source-load pairing as a product of two different pairs of power sources and loads being inductively coupled. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jaeger* in view of *Brown*.

- L. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,742,408 to *Jaeger* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,893,332 to *Brown et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Polk's remarks concerning the patentability of independent claim 17 over *Jaeger* in view of *Brown*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Jaeger* and *Brown*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of independent claim 17, all the claim limitations recited in claims 14-17 must be taught or suggested by the combination of *Jaeger* and *Brown*. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §103(a) rejection of independent claim 17, because *Jaeger* and *Brown* in combination fails to disclose, teach or "means for capacitively coupling said third power source and said load when said first power source is providing the first electric signal and said second power source is providing the second electric signal" as recited in independent claim 17.

Specifically, Examiner Polk has correctly recognized *Jaeger*'s failure to disclose, teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation. While *Brown* teaches a particular use of a capacitive coupling, *Brown* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the capacitive coupling of a power source-load pairing as a product of two sources providing electric signals. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jaeger* in view of *Brown*.

**SUMMARY**

Examiner Polk's claims objections have been obviated by the above amendment to claims 9, 16 and 17. Examiner Polk's 35 U.S.C. §§102b) and 103(a) rejections have been obviated by the remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-12, 16 and 17 over the cited art. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12, 16 and 17 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Polk is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **March 21, 2003**


Respectfully submitted,  
DEMETRI GIANNOPOULOS, *et al.*

U.S. PHILIPS  
580 White Plains Road  
Tarrytown, New York 10591  
Phone: (914) 333-9634  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

---

Robert J. Kraus  
Registration No. 26,358  
Attorney for Applicants

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113



---

Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicants